

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>FREDERICK BANKS,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:13-CV-3014</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Chief Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE</b>	:	
<b>AGENCY, et al.,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants :</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 30th day of January, 2014, upon consideration of the *pro se* plaintiff's motion (Doc. 6) for reconsideration, and it appearing that plaintiff fails to demonstrate reliance on one of three major grounds needed for a proper motion for reconsideration, North River Ins. Co. v. Cigna Reinsurance Co., 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995) (stating three major grounds include "(1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence [not available previously]; [or], (3) the need to correct clear error [of law] or prevent manifest injustice." ), but, instead, simply disagrees with the court's decision, see Waye v. First Citizen's Nat'l Bank, 846 F. Supp. 310, 314 (M.D. Pa. Feb. 4, 1994) (finding that "[a] motion for reconsideration is not to be used to reargue matters already argued and disposed of."), aff'd, 31 F.3d 1174 (3d Cir. 1994); also Database America, Inc. v. Bellsouth Adver. & Publ'g Corp., 825 F. Supp. 1216, 1220 (D.N.J. June 15, 1993) (citations omitted) (holding "[a] party seeking reconsideration must show more than a disagreement with the Court's decision, and 'recapitulation of the cases and arguments considered by the court before rendering its original decision fails to

carry the moving party's burden.'"), it is hereby ORDERED that plaintiff's motion (Doc. 6) is summarily DENIED.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge  
United States District Court  
Middle District of Pennsylvania